UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

"Bapu"
Some Thoughts at Random

By REGINALD A. REYNOLDS

What Christmas Means to a Jew

By LOUIS L. MANN

VOLUME CVIII NUMBER 17

Chicago, January 11, 1932

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*

Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

Unity Publishing Co., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago. Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*
Edith Lloyd Jones, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

Board of Directors
Mrs. S. O. Levinson, President
Mrs. E. L. Lobdell, Vice-President
Mrs. Francis Neilson, Treasurer
Mrs. Ella R. Nagely
Mrs. Edith Lloyd Jones
Mr. Irwin S. Rosenfels
Mr. C. W. Reese
Miss Matilda C. Schaff
Mrs. E. E. Smith
Mrs. Irwin S. Rosenfels
Mr. Francis Neilson
Secretary: May Johnson

Editorial Board
Edmund B. Chaffee
Zona Gale
A. Eustace Haydon
Jesse H. Holmes
Joseph Ernest McAfee
H. R. Mussey
M. C. Otto
Raymond H. Palmer
Alson H. Robinson
Clarence R. Skinner
Sydney Strong
Arthur L. Weatherly

Poetry Editors
Lucia Trent
Ralph Cheyney

Editorial Contributors
W. Waldemar W. Argow
Dorothy Walton Binder
Percy M. Dawson
James A. Fairley
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives
Australia—Charles Strong
Austria—Stefan Zweig
Bulgaria—P. M. Matthéeff
England—Harrison Brown
Fred Hankinson
Reginald Reynolds
Canada—Norman Stewart Dowd
France—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
Germany—Theodor Hahn
India—Rabindranath Tagore
Japan—Nobuichiro Imaoka
Palestine—Hans Kohn
Russia—Alina Huebsch

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
- Notes 267
- Revolution and Construction—M. C. Otto 269
- Jottings—J. H. H 271

ARTICLES—
- "Bapu"—Reginald A. Reynolds 271
- What Christmas Means to a Jew—Louis L. Mann 273
- Is Religion at an End in Russia?—Dan B. Brummit 274

POETRY—
- To Mahatma Gandhi—Kate Randle Menefee 267
- Life—Stanton A. Coblentz 272
- Four Men on a Water Tower—Raymond Kresensky 275
- Out of the Dark Gate—Fania Kruger 275

THE STUDY TABLE—
- An Englishman on India—Herbert A. Sturges 276
- Two Englishmen on Gandhi—Richard B. Gregg 277

CORRESPONDENCE—
- Developments in India—S 278
- Two Trans-Pacific Pacifists—William C. Allen 278

THE FIELD—
- New Year's Message of the General Conference of the Religious Society of Friends—Jesse H. Holmes 266
- A Note from Paris—*J. S. Woodsworth* in Winnipeg *Weekly News* 279

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

New Year's Message of The General Conference of the Religious Society of Friends New Year's Day, 1932

The Central Committee of the General Conference of Friends, in two days of meetings at The Inn at Buck Hill Falls, earnestly considered its representative position and the message of Friends. It restates that message to our time thus:

It is an experience common to mankind generally to long for a nobler and more beautiful life than we have yet achieved. While in no wise questioning the probability of life beyond death, we regard this present life as our primary and immediate responsibility, and would devote ourselves more loyally to the creation of a society based on friendliness and good will. We have failed often and seriously because of ignorance, weakness and selfishness; but our faith remains in the potential nobility of human nature, and in a power acting through human nature which may awaken it to more abundant life.

Three concerns especially claimed our attention; our duties (1) to the national prohibition law, (2) to the struggle for world peace, and (3) to the widespread misery due to unemployment.

(1) We have had active part and interest in the enactment of the prohibition amendment and laws to put it into effect. We see no reason to change our position. Prohibition was made into a law after a half century of discussion and experiment, in the effort to control a traffic in human weakness, which more and more threatened the general welfare. Good citizens will obey and support the law until it is changed in orderly and legal fashion as it was adopted. Most of the opposition to it seems to us narrow, selfish and unreasonable. No proposal of change is worthy of consideration unless it provides clearly defined plans to meet, more effectively than the present law, the evils of waste, misery and crime characteristic of the period before prohibition.

(2) We feel that the peoples of the world, in the present struggle for world peace, are meeting one of the great crises of all time. If we cannot control the tremendous forces we have discovered and harnessed, so that they will serve the interests of constructive life; if, on the contrary, we allow them to be used for destruction and death, we may well be facing the end of our attempt at civilization. Believing this we are among those who demand an end to arms and armaments. We would trust in the spirit of justice and good will, waiting for some nation to call it into action. We earnestly desire that ours shall be that nation, and welcome whatever difficulties and dangers may be involved in this high adventure.

(*Continued on page* 279)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CVIII MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 1932 Number 17

TO MAHATMA GANDHI

If on your mortal frame these eyes of mine
See only garments of an alien land,
A scarf and scanty cloth your skilful hand
Has woven, then I have not reached the line
Of vision where life's finer dreams may shine.
And I have never watched rapt thought expand
To glory of the spirit's full demand
Till it leaps forth, a radiant countersign.

But if I see you swathed in silken glow
Of dawn that brings the rising of the day,
Your robe enriched with golden threads of thought
For mortal-kind, I have touched truth, and, lo,
I see you pass, on this your journey's way,
Wrapped in a cloak a splendid life has wrought.

KATE RANDLE MENEFEE

The announcement of the committees appointed by the British cabinet to proceed to India to work on the continuing problems of the late Round Table Conference deepens rather than lightens the darkness overshadowing that unhappy land. One man only stands out as a wise appointee—the Marquess of Lothian, the Under-Secretary of State for India—and even he is an inadequate substitute for Lord Sankey, whose name does not appear at all. The omission of Sankey, coupled with the array of Tory reactionaries or Labor renegades who make up the rest of the group, is as ominous a sign as has come out of Britain in many weeks. It is ominous as showing the determination of the Empire to do nothing for India but continue her imprisonment and keep her alive by "forcible feeding." It is also ominous as showing the swift and sure capture of the MacDonald government by the Tory "die-hards." For these three Indian committees were never appointed by the Premier! On the contrary, they were dictated to him by a party which knows its power and proposes to rule. It is now plain beyond all doubt or denial that MacDonald is sitting in Downing Street only because he is willing, as the price of office, to do Tory bidding. More and more from this time on he will be the puppet of the "die-hards," until, if any remnants of self-respect are left in him at all, he will revolt at some particularly outrageous demand, and at once be cast out upon the scrap-heap. Meanwhile, India must pay the price of this surrender. And a heavy price it will be, unless all present signs are deceptive. Gandhi is landing in India as this editorial is penned. In the fortnight intervening before these words can see the light, not much may happen. The Mahatma must seek earnest conference with his associates in the National Congress. But the outcome is practically certain. The war for independence, valiantly conducted on lines of non-violent non-resistance, will go on.

The action of Congress in refusing any reconsideration of the European debts and reparations question is just about the worst thing that could happen at this time. If anything could make the outlook darker than it is at this moment, this is it. Of course, the resolution of House and Senate does not alter the actual facts by so much as the width of an eye-lash. Neither debts nor reparations will ever be paid. But the seriousness of the Congressional gesture is in its psychological effect—the adding of one more intransigeant factor to an already impossible situation. The immediate result, of course, is an enormous strengthening of the hand of Hitler in Germany. If Allied debts are not going to be reduced, or even reconsidered, then obviously there is no slightest chance of any alteration of the reparations account. This leaves open no avenue of escape for Germany in her present intolerable plight but a plunge either to the left or (as is much more probable) to the right. In either case this means the overthrow of the republic, revolution, civil war, and the disappearance for good and all of the Versailles Treaty. This in its ultimate effects may not be so bad, as the Versailles Treaty has got to go anyhow. But how do such things help the situation from the standpoint of France which wants reparations and of America which wants debts? Our Congressmen, of course, are beset by the influences of a tradition which has no more relevancy to the present world situation than the coach of George Washington to the problem of modern transportation. But more serious is the fact that they are beset by an ignorance of Europe and its present predicament which is simply abysmal. We should like to take these backwoods

statesmen for a month's stay in Germany; then lead them on a tour of Russia, and back home by the way of Austria, Italy and France. This would teach them something. And yet, on further consideration, *would it?*

Some weeks ago, in speaking of Japan's encroachments on Manchuria, we stated that the Mikado's Empire undoubtedly had a case, although such a case, however good, was no excuse for violation of treaties and resort to arms. Now, in the December 16th issue of *Zion's Herald,* there comes a presentation of this case for Japan by an intelligent man who has for many years been a missionary in the East. We do not find this case convincing as a whole, but two items of it are so convincing as to preclude all possibility of answer. The first of these items is the simple assertion that, if Japan's militarism and imperialism are a menace, we have nobody to blame but ourselves, for Japan is only what we have made her. Says this correspondent in words which we think could be fashioned into an even more damning indictment:

> After her experience with Spanish and Portuguese encroachments in the Far East, Japan shut herself up against the world for three hundred years. The United States finally succeeded in persuading Japan to open her doors again to the world by sending as our messenger Admiral Perry with his Black Ships. When Japan came out into our modern world she soon knew that the only possible way she could hold her own and save her very life as an independent nation was by building up a strong military force. And it was only after Japan had proved her military strength by conquering Russia in war that we gave her a proud place among the great nations in our Western civilization. So if we dislike Japan's military strength and her militaristic spirit, it is but fair to remember that we are responsible for it.

The second item is the charge, already stated in these columns, that Japan is doing in Manchuria only what England and France and the United States have again and again done in other places. These very nations which have prompted the League to take action against Japan are the very ones which have seen to it that the League has kept good and still while their own freebooting operations have been going on. It was not so long ago that England put 25,000 soldiers into Shanghai. France's invasion of the Ruhr, and her deeds in Morocco and Syria, have not been forgotten. America's actions in Haiti and Nicaragua are notorious. The Japanese are sensitive, and may well ask why the League of Nations acted in Manchuria and not in these cases. We come to the Far East, in other words, with dirty hands. What wonder that Japan has scorned us, and gone ahead!

South America, like the Far East, is evidently not much longer going to be the easy pickings for United States bankers and financiers that it has been in the past. Revolutions, breaking out with impressive frequency, are not the revolutions of yesteryear, when one military dictator overthrew another for the sake of capturing the swag of government. These present-day revolutions are uprisings of the people, led frequently by college graduates or even students, who are resolved that the credit bondage of their countries shall end and real liberty be restored. The situation is of course now, as it has long been, intolerable. American bankers, with money to lend at high interest rates, have tempted a dictator-president, by offer of generous rake-offs, to take a loan of ten, twenty, or fifty millions of dollars. To insure the payment of interest and the maintenance of sinking fund charges, the customs of the country in question have been placed in charge of representatives of the bank. If trouble came, the government has kindly sent in marines to make sure that there was no repudiation of the debt. And all the while the bank was getting out from under by selling the bonds at huge prices to innocent American investors. It was a great game, but it is fast drawing to a close. For a new generation is rising up in these countries who know that the loans are not honest, and who propose to rid their nations of these yokes of bondage for good and all. This is the explanation of the new-style revolutions in Chile, Bolivia, Santa Domingo, Brazil, Cuba, and elsewhere. This is also the explanation of the quotations of South American bonds at 20, 30, and 40, or even lower. It's a sad day for capitalism when the rest of the world is neither weak enough or ignorant enough to be exploited. But it's a great day for humanity when the world thus makes declaration of its freedom.

Christmas and New Year have come and gone—and Tom Mooney is still in jail. A lot Mayor Walker accomplished! Indeed, he *did* accomplish a lot—far more than anybody could have imagined—but all, alas, to hurt Mooney's interest rather than to help it. The situation in California was perhaps more favorable to Mooney two months ago than it had ever been before since the tragedy of 1916. A quiet hearing, a fair statement of the case, and it is not unlikely that a timid but amiable Governor would have granted the pardon so long delayed. Then suddenly, for selfish purposes of his own well understood in New York, where the Mayor's political and personal plight is every day getting more precarious, "Jimmy" jumped into a drama of which he knew little and for which he cared less, and stirred up a sensation which swept the continent. Nothing of course could have been worse, so far as Tom Mooney is concerned. At once the forces of opposition, long slumbering in contented ease, were wide awake. The reaction to Mayor Walker's selfish, insincere and silly sob-stuff, in other words, was a marshalling of all the influences in California which are determined to keep Mooney and Billings in jail through the remaining period of their natural lives. The result is that the Governor is now faced by an opposition which might well daunt a braver man than

himself. If he releases Mooney, it will be an act of almost unprecedented political courage. But all the chances are against it. And to Mayor Walker be the blame! As for Frank Walsh and Aaron Sapiro, who conceived this inane stunt, we have nothing but admiration for their long, able, and self-sacrificing service on Mooney's behalf. But when they stooped to this miserable business of enlisting a shallow and shiftless political trickster to serve their ends, they did a thing as unworthy of their character as it was disastrous to their cause.

But let us be fair! Mayor Walker's intervention in the Mooney case did one good thing. It projected against the background of "Jimmy's" playboy performance, the grim and terrible determination of that great mass of public opinion in this country which is resolved to see Mooney free. Not since the Mooney-Billings case became a national scandal, have we felt such a crusading spirit in the air as now. The hour is at hand, as it came to hand at one fateful moment in the Dreyfus case in France, when the long conspiracy is doomed at last to break. There is more in these things, in other words, than laws and courts and governments. There is public opinion, moved as it is ever moved by psychological influences so hard to chart yet so momentously effective. In some instances—that of Sacco and Vanzetti, for example—public opinion fails, primarily because it does not have time to operate upon stubborn opposition. This is the reason why capital punishment, with its definite limitation of the time process, is so frequently fatal to justice. But in the Mooney case this peril was removed when Mooney's sentence was commuted years ago to life imprisonment. This was the first and crucial victory. Now, through the years, the tide has been rolling in, and today is reaching that flood which we call "the psychological moment." The histrionics of the Walker performance delayed this "moment" beyond the span of 1931. But it cannot delay it, nor can anything else delay it, we believe, beyond the span of this new year. We see little in the prospect of 1932 to give us cheer. But there is one ray of light in this gross darkness, and this is the ray that shines down upon Mooney's prison-cell. Before another Christmas, Tom Mooney will be free!

Revolution and Construction

Let us assume that the case against revolution is made. Let us grant that revolutionary method is, as has been contended, a very costly method, inevitably resulting in the sacrifice of much that is precious and giving no assurance that the substituted state of affairs will be better than the one it replaced. A realist will incline to say, What difference does this make? History shows that periodically individuals, institutions, and societies are forced into a blind alley with no possibility of getting out except through reliance upon violent means. This may not be nice, but it happens to be actual.

Nor is it difficult to show that revolutionary projects have opened the way to social improvement. From the viewpoint of idealism settling an issue by fighting it out may be as irrational as tossing a coin, nevertheless the actual course of events seems to know but one way, the revolutionary way, of finding a new route. Considered theoretically, there may be other ways of securing social change; practically considered, there is but one.

The wide prevalence of the appeal to force as a technique of change may be hidden from us by the peculiar form which it sometimes takes. Non-resistance, for example, which on the surface appears to be the very antithesis of fighting, is almost without exception an appeal to might. As a means for gaining ends it differs from the more manifest appeals to might primarily, in most cases exclusively, in the nature of the weapons employed. Like many another attitude which is looked upon as being negative, non-resistance is really positive and aggressive. We have only to think of what is going on in India to appreciate the fact that effective non-resistance is actually a calculated program of attack. In such cases indeed the dependence upon force may be all the more complete because its significant function in the situation is not suspected and hence not subjected to criticism.

Moreover, it must be admitted that there are times when no other possibility of action seems feasible. Not infrequently it happens that while one individual or group is willing to meet half way and talk things over, the other is stubbornly unwilling. This being the case, and at the same time conditions being unbearable, what is to be done? In other words, crises arise which offer no alternatives but two: an appeal to might or unconditional surrender. And if such unconditional surrender involves the sacrifice of objects of sufficient value, then the two alternatives are reduced to one. Nothing remains but to fight. Surrender under such circumstances would hardly be regarded as noble.

Nor is this as yet a complete analysis of the place of might in affairs. Might is operative even when it is not specifically appealed to, when other means are relied upon for the settlement of differences. Even when arbitration or conference is the method employed, force is present in the background. Genuine arbitration or conference is out of the question unless the

parties to it are equal, and this as a rule means that the elements of power they represent and will fall back upon if agreement is not arrived at, are such as to make the combat a real one, a combat that in such a case is doubtful as to its outcome.

What does this all come to? It comes to this, does it not—that we live in a world of inescapable conflict? The conflicting forces may perchance be dealt with but they cannot be escaped. In the sub-human orders of being issues are decided, as far as we have been able to discover, by the relative strength of the forces involved. Force is the sole determining factor. When the human level is reached we still have the element of force to consider. Many conflicts are still decided in the same manner, that is, in terms of sheer power, and must be so decided. And it happens that issues which at one time might have been developed differently, cannot be so dealt with because, through inability or unwillingness to act when the problem was still in a plastic state, conflicting forces have arrived at an impasse from which there is no escape except through violent action. And even where this is not the case, where the stage is most favorably set for deliberation and rational choice, the situation is still one of competitive forces confronting each other, of urgency, power, might having a say. Rather than ignore this fact, a realistic idealist would emphasize it; for he aims at a reconstruction and harmony of actualities, not a theoretical unification of conceptual differences.

Having conceded this much to the presence and significance of force, something remains to be said of another aspect of the picture. The moment one thinks about the question, it is clear that power is not so distributed among individuals or societies in the world, that in case of conflict and an appeal to might, the outcome is bound to be best. However, best or right or justice may be defined, there is no evidence that when the strongest has had his way, the resulting state is best or right or just—unless, indeed, these terms are defined as Thrasymachus long ago defined them, when he was urged on by Socrates, namely as synonymous with the interest of the stronger.

Now if it is untrue that strength and goodness—however defined—are twins, then it follows that to deal constructively with the issues of life involves reliance upon something other than force. The fact that numerous improvements have been introduced into everyday living, that devices for comfort and physical well-being, for general education, and the means of arriving at better understanding, have been multiplied, shows that something besides might has operated. And this something else is the ability shown every day by man, in matters great and small, to resolve conflicts of interests in himself and between himself and others, by reconstructing the situation so that a new object becomes a joint aim. The man or woman who has an object he wants to dispose of and which, as things turn out, another wants to buy, illustrates the process, even if the transaction is a simple one.

It is not, however, in this more practical and circumscribed area of affairs that we lack faith in the inventive ability of mankind. We have seen altogether too much evidence of it there to be sceptical. It is in reference to large social problems—marriage and the family, capital and labor, the profit motive and business, international antagonisms, that we are inclined to think men limited to but one method of procedure, namely, the exercise of force. Intelligence and inventiveness admittedly have a place, but only as pointing out the most certain way of making force tell.

What is the reason for this lack of faith? One reason is obviously the great complexity of the problems. But complexity is not in itself sufficient to explain the attitude. That men can march in confidence up to complex problems, and deal with them magnificently, is shown by what happened when the Great War came. The same war has suggested to many what it is we lack. We lack the instrumentalities for dealing with social problems in times of peace comparable to those we have or create in times of war. And why do we lack these instrumentalities? In the main because, as an historical accident, we have assigned the responsibility for formulating ideals to one class of men and institutions and the conduct of living to another class of men and institutions. But the inescapable fact is that aims and ends which function in conduct do and must develop out of the conditions they are intended to further. Our insistence upon handing over to men ready-made ideals formulated by detached experts, does two things: it encourages those who are busy in the everyday walks of life to look upon idealism as irrelevant and to shirk all responsibility for seriously considering the social meaning of their activity.

The revolutionizing period in which we live creates an extraordinary opportunity for improvement, but it does not itself insure the improvement or move necessarily in that direction. Improvement involves constructive inventiveness. And social improvement, in any large and secure sense, is dependent upon constructive inventiveness dedicated to the ideal of progressively remaking social institutions in the direction of human weal. So we return once more to a great need of the times, the need for men and women who are willing to put revolutionary ardor and devotion into a less spectacular rôle—who are willing to help prepare the intellectual and emotional predisposition upon which we must depend for the imagining and constructing of better means of living.

M. C. Otto.

Jottings

The names of well-known men, dead since our annual report in the December 20th issue of UNITY, are ARNOLDO MUSSOLINI, brother of Il Duce and prominent member of the Fascist dynasty; JOHN M. VAN HEUSEN, inventor of the soft collar; and MELVIL DEWEY, library expert.

Patricia Kendall, author of "Come With Me To India," recently reviewed in UNITY, states that British financial investments in India "now produce twenty per cent of the direct or indirect income of every man, woman and child in Great Britain." This explains a lot!

There's a good side to all ill. One discovers it in the announcement of the Internal Revenue Department that over one hundred million *less* cigarettes were smoked last month than the corresponding month a year ago. Perhaps Americans are going to throw off their drug habit after all.

"Daugherty Defends Harding"—newspaper announcement of the new Daugherty book on the Harding administration.

This would seem to indicate a rewriting of the old adage, "Set a thief to catch a thief."

It is conservatively estimated that there are not less than 100,000,000 men and women in distress in the world at this present hour. If we should add to these the millions in India and China, for example, who are always next door to starvation, there would be not less than twice this figure of the distressed. And yet the world has abundant material resources, wonderful machinery, and more labor than it can use. What's the matter?

The noblest Christmas message of 1931 was spoken by Mahatma Gandhi—a Hindu!

J. H. H.

"Bapu"

(Some Thoughts at Random)

[From Our Special Correspondent]

At nine o'clock on the morning of Saturday, December 5th, a small crowd was gathered on one of the platforms at Victoria Station. Perhaps a hundred people, English and Indian, were assembled to say farewell to the rarest spirit of our time, who for three months had been our guest. Press photographers drove a wedge through our small band to get their last snaps of Mr. Gandhi—to be published later in the day, with a few sneering paragraphs. There was a hasty clasping of hands; a murmur of blessings by men who found themselves suddenly inarticulate. A few tried to sing "Auld Lang Syne." Some Indians shouted "Mahatma Gandhijiki jai." I have heard that shout from fifty thousand throats, and joined in it joyously; but as the train steamed from Victoria station the noise of cheering fell on my ears like rain upon the fastened windows of an inner silence.

The newspapers compared Gandhi's departure to his coming. All but a few at that time had "taken him up"—patronized him, in fact, with the confidence bred of experience. It is a way we have here with all manner of inconvenient people, from British Socialists to Indian nationalists. First ignore them. If that fails, fight them. Lastly, if you fail there, call them good fellows and worthy adversaries. Such is the formula.

Our last weapon is our most dangerous one, and it has seldom failed. The enemy is entertained, lionised and flattered. By this means his claws may be painlessly pared and his teeth unostentatiously extracted. Of all forms of bribery it is the most subtle—even Samson fell to it. The betrayal is almost unnoticeable, so gradual is the process. MacDonald, Briand, Clemenceau, Frank Hodges, John Burns are all types familiar to those who have studied politics in any part of the World.

Against Gandhi our weapon broke. He did and suffered everything that he should theoretically have avoided. Just as he had entered the spider's web at Delhi and Simla, so he walked recklessly into it at St. James's Palace and Whitehall. I saw him shortly after he had seen the King, with the traditional formalities in the way of speeches, conventional and meaningless.

It was a difficult decision (he said), but I had to go through with it. My coming to the Conference meant a determination to leave no stone unturned in an effort to secure a peaceful settlement. I have done everything that was possible.

And now he is going back to India empty-handed. It is perhaps premature to speak yet of Civil Disobedience, when the Mahatma himself has declined to make a definite statement. On the other hand, it is equally obvious that there has been no agreed settlement, and that a truce without a settlement cannot last long. In India the people are chafing at an armistice with an unscrupulous opponent who breaks the terms when he chooses. The new Bengal Ordinance is calculated to inflame public opinion to the point of violence. Meanwhile it is proposed that the propertied classes in India should be given a limited control of everything except 85% of the Central budget, which is to be "reserved" even beyond the reach of the Indian aristocracy, under such heads as "Debts" (which are presumably to remain unchallenged), the Army and the Salaries of our officials! That is only the first and worst part of this proposed settlement, but enough to explain why the Mahatma hinted at a "parting of the ways." Until he has consulted his colleagues it is clearly impossible for him to say more than that, even of the most preposterous proposals.

But I did not intend this to be an account of

"Round Table" politics. They only come into my retrospect in relation to the changes registered by the press and public opinion. Partly it was due, of course, to the gradual "denovelising" of Mahatma Gandhi in two senses: that is to say, he became by increasing familiarity less of a novelty and less of a fiction. But what influenced opinion more was his continual and disturbing insistence on a certain Congress mandate, four-cornered and central to his political firmament as the Ptolemaic Earth.

Those of us who held that this conference could achieve no useful object stand justified by the logic of events. On the other hand, our somewhat unworthy fears that "Bapu" would be "bamboozled" into some trumpery and illusive settlement have proved unfounded. I think that Mahatma Gandhi is what I call a pess-optimist—that is to say, a man who makes the best of a bad job. The conference was a bad job, but he made the best of it by demonstrating its futility.

Without doubt his attitude and his innumerable personal contacts won him friends. More friends, doubtless, than any other man could have made, because every meeting with "Bapu" is a personal meeting, even if it is what we call a public meeting, numbered in thousands. But most people knew him only through the press, which is the same as saying that they didn't know him at all; he might as well have been in India. To these people he was a dark-skinned and dark-souled mystery, who had come to England to "co-operate" (that is to say, to agree to our proposals), and remained instead to hurl his almost solitary defiance against what appeared to be the united opposition of his fellow-countrymen and of the British government. Not for nothing had the Government appointed the "delegates" itself; and in this carefully packed conference Gandhi the Implacable was to show in sinister contrast to fantom armies of Moslems and "Untouchables" popularly supposed to be supporting the Aga Khan and Dr. Ambedkar!

So he leaves us, loved by many, but to most a greater enigma than ever. Not here, but in his own country, must the battle be fought and won, and those of us who regard ourselves as his garrison in this country do not flatter ourselves with any hope of victory where he has failed. Our conscious purpose is not the conversion of England, but the building up of a pioneer army. The fire that Mahatma Gandhi has lit will spread throughout Asia and Africa. He will be weighed with Lenin in the judgment of posterity, when the imperialism that each strove against will be regarded as an obsolete form of barbarism. It is for that day that we in England must organize—for the day when the last vestige of empire will have passed from us and left us, like modern Germany, changed in circumstances rather than in mind. In that day we shall see whether England can learn in the shame and agony of defeat the wisdom of the Galilean whom we have mocked with our prayers and the Hindu whom we persecuted and flattered alike in vain.

* * *

I wandered back to the office at Knightsbridge, where Bapu's little staff had worked during the conference. It was strewn with empty packing cases, paper and oddments. Here on that last evening we had assembled for prayers in a room tightly packed with Indian and English friends, sitting on the floor. As the chants filled the room I shut my eyes and pictured to myself a patch of sand above the river Sabarmati were "Bapu" ("Daddy," that is to say) sits with his little flock of followers every morning at 4:15 and every evening at 7. I could imagine again the deep velvet blue of the Indian night and the clear radiance of Indian moonlight. I remembered the morning of the Great March—the tension and excitement of the night that had preceded it, the crowds that thronged round the ashram from sunset to dawn, and lined the three mile road to Ahmedabad, 100,000 strong. I remembered the calmness of Bapu, who slept with an easy conscience and arose eager and jubilant. I saw him again, as we passed from the prayer-ground, walking between that noble old Moslem, Abbas Tyabji, and Sir Prabhashankar Pattani. Pattani is a Hindu, an old friend of Bapu's, although formerly an Administrator in various Indian States. Suddenly on that great occasion Bapu's two hands shot up and seized the long white beards of his two companions, drawing their heads together. It was to signify Hindu-Moslem unity!

Such recollections had been suddenly interrupted by an English voice, singing an English melody. I suppose it was not quite right of me, anyway, to be reminiscing about Bapu when we were all supposed to be engaged in prayer, though one might find a worse religious exercise. But now they were singing "Lead Kindly Light"—Bapu's favorite among our English hymns, and I joined in. It stirred other memories, but the present loomed vividly in the words:

So long thy power hath blessed me, sure it still
Will lead me on o'er moor and fen, o'er crag and torrent, till
The night is gone. . . .

And now from the recollection of recollections I turned my mind to an empty and desolate house that would one day be visited by travellers. I wondered what legends would grow up.

* * *

The evening found me at Kingsley Hall, where Bapu had lived during those three months—a settlement in the East End. His cell on the roof was in perfect order, set out as it had been when he lived there. I wondered what quaint thought had led to this, and how long it would extend its mute invitation to a guest who would never, surely, return. I came down to the hall on the ground-floor and found people dancing. Somewhere over the Channel a French express was swiftly bearing from us the man we had scorned, persecuted, flattered and abused. Was he spinning? Every moment even of a journey, he will occupy. Perhaps he was writing. Or perhaps they were singing again those verses of the Gita that embodied the Creed of Mahatma Gandhi—the perfectibility of man through truth, love and purity; and the triumph of the Spirit over the passion and suffering of the body.

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS.

Life

Out of the white and famished East
The wan-eyed pilgrims roam,
Hoping to find, in sunset lands,
A fair and fruitful home.

And on the way they pass those hordes
Who, in a wan-eyed quest,
Looking for warmth and flowers, leave
The white and famished West.

STANTON A. COBLENTZ.

What Christmas Means to a Jew*

Through a unique set of circumstances the Jew has never observed Christmas, even though it commemorates the birth of a great Jew. The centuries of persecution that the Jew has suffered in the name of him who taught love, peace and good will, as the great essentials of life, naturally estranged the Jew from the memory of the man who was flesh of their flesh, bone of their bone and spirit of their spirit. We thank God that brighter times have come! This service is conceived in love, nurtured in faith and consecrated to good will.

What does Christmas mean to a Jew? Three things: First, an achievement, secondly, a hope, and thirdly, a promise.

First, then, an achievement. Christmas today has outgrown its historic origin and is symbolic of the message of Christianity, which message is largely Jewish. Christianity brought the pagan world near to Judaism—at least ninety percent of the way. Christianity Judaized the pagan world, and thereby extended, popularized and universalized Judaism. The great Jewish philosophers in the Middle Ages, Maimonides and Halevi taught that Christianity and Mohammedanism though they contained some non-Jewish elements, should be looked upon as missionaries for Judaism. Judaism is the Religion *of* Jesus; Paul contributed the Religion *about* Jesus. The Religion *of* Jesus *and* the Religion *about* Jesus together form Christianity. More than nine-tenths of the New Testament is thoroughly Jewish and is paralleled in Talmudic literature as all scholars know. Two German scholars, Strack and Billerbeck, have published all the evidence. Through Christianity, the Jewish concept of the God of Love taught by Hosea 740 B. C. was popularized and universalized. Through Christianity, the Golden Rule taught by Rabbi Hillel was broadcast to the pagan world. Through Christianity, the idea found in the book of Leviticus in the Old Testament, in the 5th century B. C., "Love Thy Neighbor as Thyself," was made known to a larger world. Through Christianity, the daughter religion, the prophet Malachi's vision of the Fatherhood of God, and the Brotherhood of Man, proclaimed six centuries earlier were taught to ever increasing numbers. Jesus was *born* as a Jew, *lived* as a Jew, *died* as a Jew, and never wished for, and never knew that there would be a *new* religion. The achievement of Christianity came in universalizing some of the lofty ethical concepts of Jesus the Jew.

Secondly, Christianity gives to a Jew, a *hope*. This hope is that there might be *more* Christianity, more real Christianity, the Christianity of *faith, love, good will* and *fellowship* to all of God's creatures, without pettiness, malice, prejudice and ill-will. Heywood Broun recently published a book called "Christians Only," in which he assembled tens of thousands of cases of prejudice, discriminations, disabilities visited upon Jews not only to the third and fourth generations, but to the thousandth generation. The book makes sad reading because it is accurate. It should have been called "Gentiles Only" instead of "Christians Only," because the moment a man is guilty of prejudice, hatred and unjust discrimination, he thereby ceases to be a Christian. As long as newspapers will accept advertisements for help containing the words: "No Jews need apply," as long as hospitals limit woefully the number of Jewish physicians on the staff, as long as many schools and universities have a definite quota limiting the number of Jews that may enter, as long as there are apartment houses restricted against Jewish occupancy—all of which happen frequently in the United States, to say nothing of the unashamed persecution and discrimination of Hitlerism in Germany, the deliberate and unabashed *"numerus clausus"* in Hungary, the wilful and wanton economic boycott in Poland, the bloody student warfare in Roumania—as long as to these obvious brutalities and unashamed indecencies, there are added the non-violent and silent programs of discrimination, the memory of Jesus, the teachings of Jesus are being *crucified*—not by Jews, but by those who wrongly call themselves "Christians." The modern Jew hopes that there might be more Christianity—more real Christianity—not only for Christians in relation to others, but also for Christians in relation to themselves. As a rabbi, I am a public servant. I am serving on some very important committees, both locally and nationally. The difficulties that arise in having Protestants and Catholics serve together are innumerable, often insuperable. Are they not both Christians? Are not both children of God? Have you read "Painted Windows," a book describing the religious conditions in England? A man met a clergyman and asked: "Tell me, are the High Church and the Low Church still at war?" "No, no," said he, "we're at peace, we've united to fight the Catholics"—*at peace, fighting the Catholics!* Recently a person returned from Ireland. When he was asked about religious conditions between the north and the south, the Protestants and the Catholics, he answered, "I wish to God that we were all heathen so that we could live like Christians."

The time has come, I firmly believe, when the crucifixion story must be retold so as not to make the Jew the villain in the drama of salvation. That the Jews did not kill Jesus every scholar knows. So long as this story is taught to innocent children, they cannot in the nature of things, grow up to manhood and womanhood, without prejudice against the Jew, and in that way *undermine all the love and good will toward and faith in* one's fellowman without which Christianity cannot stand. The Christmas season proclaims peace and good will. The crucifixion story makes it impossible. The Jew, therefore, on Christmas Day hopes that there might be more Christianity—more *real* Christianity—so that love and brotherhood might be real among Catholics and Protestants, Jews and Christians, and among all the children of one Father and one God.

Thirdly, Christmas to the Jew means a *promise,* the promise of the hand of fellowship and co-operation for all that is good and true and beautiful. Jews and Christians may differ, and do differ, upon ideas of original sin, vicarious atonement, immaculate conception, virgin birth, trinity, the divinity of Jesus, the coming of the Messiah, and the like. But, what are these differences compared to the overwhelming number of similarities that unite Jews and Christians. Christmas should teach us all to *minimize* differences and to *emphasize* resemblances. No man's creed is wrong whose deed is right. Godless Jews and Christ-less Christians set up barriers that only God-revering Jews

*Radio talk over WGN.

and Christ-like Christians can remove. No creed has a monopoly on righteousness. Goodness is non-sectarian.

What difference does it make whether one follow the Old Testament, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," or the New Testament, "Love ye one another"? What difference does it make whether one follow the Old Testament, "beat swords into plowshares and spears into pruning hooks," or the New Testament, "they that take up the sword shall perish by the sword"? What difference does it make whether one follow the Old Testament, "have we not all one Father, hath not one God created us all," or the New Testament, "out of one flesh and blood hath God created all the peoples of the earth"? What difference does it make whether one follow the Old Testament with its concern for "the poor, the orphan, the stranger and the widow," or the New Testament, "blessed are the merciful"?

Too long have religions, including Christianity and Judaism regarded each other as enemies! The time has come to fight—not one another—but together, to fight the common enemies of all religions: greed, fear, superstition, crime, corruption, disease, poverty, child labor, old age insecurity, ignorance and war. Unless religion can conquer these enemies, they will conquer religion. Christianity, alone, if it were sufficiently consecrated—with its 450,000,000 devotees in all parts of the world—could stop the barbarity, the brutality and the bestiality of war. If Christians, everywhere—because of their sheer number—would say, "we shall not, we will not kill," there could be no war, diplomats notwithstanding.

For such peace and good will, including all, and excluding none—for such a promise of cooperation and fellowship—the Jew stands ready to extend the hand of fellowship to recreate a world so as to hasten "the one far off, divine event toward which all creation moves," when men will really love God whom they cannot see, because they love their fellowmen whom they can see.

LOUIS L. MANN.

Is Religion at an End in Russia?*

Almost every American I meet says, "Just what is there in this anti-religious propaganda of the Soviets? And what's back of it?" Much is back of it, and there's a lot in it. Perhaps what follows may be a part answer to these questions. A complete answer would take a book, and vastly more familiarity with the whole subject than I can boast.

The Russian state is definitely atheistic. This fact colors all its dealings with religious agencies of every name, and not merely the Greek Orthodox church, which before the revolution was the state church, closely allied with the tsarist autocracy.

It is often said, and truly, that the Soviet enmity against religion is not surprising, since the old Russian church did so little for the people, and so much against them. But that is far from being the whole story. Soviet Russia is founded on a materialistic theory of the cosmos. It not only disbelieves in the spiritual, in what we not too wisely call the supernatural, but it believes that any religious faith whatever is out of harmony with the purposes of the state.

The evils of the old church are not forgotten, as the anti-religious museums in the great cities bear eloquent witness. And in the Soviet propaganda against religion the terrible story of an apostate church affords any amount of effective material.

The drive against religion goes further, and deeper. It is a drive against the whole religious—spiritual, if you will—conception of life. Things constitute the only world, say the Communists; and we shall always be hindered in our effort to improve the world of things so long as there are people who believe in spiritual forces and a future life. To put it in a sentence, which the Russians use as a slogan, ringing the changes on it in every imaginable way: "Religion is the opiate of the people."

The Russian atheists identify religion with superstition, which is not surprising. The old church was a hot bed of superstition, much of it highly profitable to the priests. I saw on the walls of the former tsarina's bedroom in the one-time imperial summer palace near Leningrad over eight hundred ikons—religious pictures—each credited with some peculiar virtue or miracle-working power. Indeed, one of the counts in the quarrel between the remnant of the Living church, of which so much was hoped ten years ago, and the old church leaders, has to do with the miraculous efficacy of each group's ikons.

The religion of the present regime is a religion of social action, justice, and material advance. It is a rebound from the "opiate" of magical, other-worldly, and often meaningless forms, to the visible realities of better foods, better homes, and more things of every sort.

The churches are still open, of course. The state does not forbid worship. All it does forbid is social work, educational activities, recreation, and even simple association for other purposes than worship. Preaching, as we know it, is not possible in Russia. The average American preacher would find himself in hot water with the state before he had been speaking ten minutes. Nine-tenths of his carefully prepared sermons and sermon notes would be of no use to him at all.

I attended a church service in Moscow. It was a depressing experience. The proceedings undoubtedly gave comfort of some sort to the two dozen old people who attended, but they were wholly formal, and seemed to have no relation to reality. I felt that I was watching the quiet instinctive repetition of an age-old routine that made no demands whatever on the worshipers' minds or consciences, and very little on their senses. The one thing that brought the service out of the vagueness was the little procession at the end, when each worshiper came up to the priest, received his blessing, and dropped an offering into the plate held by an assistant.

That offering was most important. Priests have no claim on the state, as of old; they are distinctly not favored in the matter of food, and only the pitifully

*The author of this article was a fellow-member of the party in which Mr. Holmes traveled in Russia. He is the distinguished editor of the *Northwestern Christian Advocate*.

small gifts of the faithful keep them from actual starvation.

The first religious result of the revolution was the freeing of the "sects"—Baptists, Lutherans and a few others—from the limitations imposed by the state under the tsar. For a time things looked promising. The door was open to active evangelization, and plans were made for an advance. But as the Bolsheviks grew in power, and at the same time in appreciation of the size of the job they had undertaken, the door began to close. Today it is tight shut.

The state has no intention of relaxing its harsh control over public religious work. Priests, ministers, and rabbis are disfranchised. Churches which have no sufficiently large group of worshipers within easy reach are liable to be closed and even torn down.

The Orthodox church priests were long the open enemies of Soviet rule, and gave active support to the several efforts made during the civil war following the peace treaty of Brest-Litovsk to overthrow the Bolshevik power. The men and women who now rule in the Kremlin have not forgotten that, nor will they forget it. They say it is all of a piece with the church's long history of oppression, greed, and blood. The memory of "Bloody Sunday" is still kept vividly alive —that terrible winter day when Father Gapon, said to have been a government stool pigeon, led thousands of Russians into the great square before the Winter Palace. They had come to present their grievances humbly but confidently to the Little White Father, the tsar. He was not even in the palace, and when the thousands were packed in the square the soldiers came out from a side street and opened fire. The people fled in terror, leaving 1,500 corpses lying in the snow.

The campaign for an atheistic state goes vigorously forward. The Society of the Godless claims four million members; its work is done with a crusading passion and devotion. To a western Christian the campaign seems strangely out of date. It is not directed against Christianity at all, as we know it. The eager young atheists connect religion, of course, with the only church they know anything about. They connect it with the worst evils that have gathered around the Russian church—the greed and immorality of the priests, the drunkenness that marked the great church festivals, the enrichment of the church's institutions, and its complete identification with all the tyranny of the tsarist days.

Does all this mean the end of religion in Russia?

Well, consider the fury against the church and against religion in the light of what the Russian people now glorify as a way of life. In spite of the aggressive secularism and materialism which marks the Russian scene today, a real religious revival is under way. The authorities would scornfully deny this. But what are the facts?

Here is a government which could not last a month except for its appeal to the idealism of its supporters. Although it is aggressively anti-religious, it counts largely on those human qualities which for two thousand years have been associated with Christianity—brotherhood, mutual aid, self-denial to the point of sacrifice, care for children, the sick and the aged, the welfare of the beloved community, and the like.

A new generation is training itself and being trained in the exercise of these Christian virtues. As the war against hunger and disease and ignorance progresses, the young people will develop a newly critical intelligence.

Who shall deny that they must one day discover that the religion they have been trained to despise and hate was not Christianity at all, but a repellent caricature of it?

What is to prevent this discovery that the finest expressions of Communist theory are at their center Christian, or to block a related discovery that these Communist virtues were long ago bound up in a person, who in his life on earth was the embodiment of brotherhood, service, self-denial, and sacrifice even unto death?

The Russian church had long forgotten to teach this to the people. It could say that it was rich and increased with goods. Its riches and its goods have gone. Some of its sacred places have been turned to alien uses, some have been demolished, and most of them remain to show how empty a church can be when there is no reality in its ceremonial.

To my mind, Russia's so-called "war on religion" is at once an indictment of the sort of religion which Russia has known, and a warning to the churches of the west that they should keep themselves from idols, and give themselves to the things in religion which are really religious.

DAN B. BRUMMIT.

Four Men on a Water Tower

Four men on a water tower
Erasing the rust time has laid,
Defied gravity's laws—
Four men with hooks and ladders,
Rods and ropes—
Tools they worshipped,
The machinery of gods.

I was sick of my God, high on his throne
And far away.
I was tired of seeing Christ
Men called a myth.
These loved a new god, a new creature,
Not of their hearts, but of their hands.

. . . . .

This morning a ladder toppled;
Four men lay on the ground.
Eight hands that had created gods
Were mangled.
Four brains that had reasoned their new god
Were splattered.

. . . . .

O God of Abraham, mighty and cruel,
God of Jesus, vague and forgotten,
What of these?

RAYMOND KRESENSKY

Out of the Dark Gate

You strive for calm upon a lonely night
When envy will not liberate your mind,
When hatred quenches reason, blurs the sight,
And makes a gaping wound and strikes you blind.
You whisper futile dreams to walls of stone,
Your burdened heart knows only sodden storm—
You learn, my soul, to conquer strength alone;
From groping blindness can emerge truth's form.

When you will open wide the darkened gate
And learn the true from false and free the earth
Of roiling blackest clouds of envy, hate,
Then you will know exultancy of birth!
What need of envy, hate—a two-edged knife?
For love and only love fashions a life!

FANIA KRUGER.

The Study Table

An Englishman on India

If ever the world needed saving it is now. Gandhi, moved by the ancient teachings of friendliness in his own Hindu religion, and in the Sermon on the Mount as interpreted by Tolstoy, experiments with the practical applications of these truths in some difficult modern problem-situations in the Transvaal and in his own India. Gandhi in turn influences others to accept these principles, truth, soul-force, the power of kindness—to overcome evil, violence, cruelty and fear. He demonstrates repeatedly the success of *Satyagraha,* "doing good against evil."

Again idealism is born anew in the East. From Asia comes a fresh religious message, with practical efficiency proved by trial—in the Passive Resistance movement in England with regard to Education; in the non-violent opposition to the Black Act in the Transvaal, and in the great nationalist, non-cooperative, civil disobedience movement for independence in India. So we are interested in books about India.

The author of this book* is a member of the British official class. He was born in India. His father and three uncles had served in India. Of his own generation, four cousins and a brother preceded him.

In a lecture given by Sir Francis twenty-five years ago he raised the question: What should be the true relationship between Britain and India?

> It should not be that of conqueror to conquered. It could be paternal or fraternal. What should it be? I replied that it both could and should be that of manly *comradeship.* I recalled how on many a hard-fought battlefield Indian soldiers had proved themselves true comrades, how civil officials at the end of their career looked back with affection on friendships with Chiefs . . ., how the faithful Indian servants had stood by us in many a difficulty and sympathized with us in many a trouble, how the people of India were unbounded and never failing in their hospitality. . . .
>
> And this idea of comradeship I still think, now . . . should be the governing idea in all our dealings with India. Indeed, I think it is now more necessary than ever. . . .
>
> And comrades we may remain even if India got . . . a complete severance of the political connection with Great Britain. Even if India were as entirely independent of the British Empire as Japan or Persia, she and India might still be comrades. . . .

The British contribution to India includes pacification. The first of the native rulers with which the author was associated was the Mir of Hunza. In those days the Mir "would frequently be attacking villages of neighboring states. Similarly, his villages would be attacked by them. There was constant petty warfares."

In 1891 this chief was replaced by his brother.

> Raids on distant trade routes have ceased. Attack and counter-attack on and by neighboring villages no longer take place. . . . The peace of British paramountcy has descended upon that distant mountain state.

Thus the author attaches considerable value to peace. But he accepts the condition of international violence, and he does not condemn the Government for violence against the people. In the first place, then, the Indians are not able to defend India, and thus cannot have responsible government without the help of Britain and her army. He pictures a possible combination of foreign force which India would be unable to resist.

> And this inability to defend India against outside aggression and internal trouble is the block in the way of India's progress toward the declared goal of self-government.

But the people of India are learning from Gandhi and teaching to the rest of the world that self-defense can far better be carried out by *Ahimsa* and *Satyagraha* than by a national army. The spiritual power of a whole nation practicing these tremendous virtues is incalculable. No other "defense" of India can possibly be required. In soul-force India has the best possible means of defense. By manifesting what the author calls comradeship, goodwill towards all, India will be made safe—is already safe—from predatory activities by other countries. She is now saving herself from the British—has really saved herself already, although the British have not yet grasped the fact that they are already "out" of India, and can no longer exploit India.

But if the people of India have in fact the power of self-defense, they cannot be considered incapable of self-government. As a matter of essential fact India probably has now a responsible self-government, although little is said about it and it is not officially "recognized." Thus although the author is proud of the "peace" established in India by the British, he fails to realize the extent to which external peace is also possible.

In the second place, the author seems to think violence and blood-shed on the part of the Government against the people necessary under some circumstances. He does not condemn the Dyer massacre.

> The civil authorities lost all hold over the great city of Amritsar. The military had to be called in. . . . And when . . . some thousands organized a meeting . . . he fired on them . . . and killed some hundreds. The incipient revolt was checked. . . .

Thus while Sir Francis takes credit for the establishment of "peace" in India by Britain, he does not notice the growing power of Gandhi's movement to create a greater and more lasting peace. The author praises the British for putting an end to tribal warfare, and expects Government to exercise violence against "incipient revolt." He also contemplates violent international conflict involving India.

The real peace movement should do away with all violence. The author's easy acceptance of the "pax Brittanica" is unworthy of him. He does not set his goal of peace high enough. It remains for Gandhi and his followers to proclaim and to demonstrate these truly high and broadly inclusive principles of peace through the power of love.

Another probably erroneous view presented in this book is that India was represented by the Committee of Indians sitting with the Simon Commission. The fact that there were some Indians sitting with the Simon Commission seems to the author conclusive. The Report of this Commission should be accepted by all Indians!

> ". . . was it a wise, or a friendly, or a saintly act of Gandhi to insist that Dominion Status must be granted forthwith, though even the Committee of Indians sitting with the Simon Commission had not asked for immediate but gradual advancement toward Dominion Status?"

Here the implication is that the Indians of the Committee were qualified to speak for India, probably merely because they were Indians! Since they were not so qualified or empowered by the people of India to represent them before the Simon Commission, the author's apparent conclusions as to the binding power

*"Dawn in India, British Purpose and Indian Aspiration." By Sir Francis Younghusband. Published by Frederick A. Stokes Co., 1930.

of the Simon Report on the Indian nation are invalid.

In many other respects this book is very well worth reading. It is full of important historical information, and fine appreciation of great Indians like Tagore, Gandhi, Radhakrishnan, and Sadhu Sundar Singh.

Although Sir Francis condemns Gandhi for his opposition to Government, he pays high tribute to his religious contribution:

As regards himself (Gandhi) says: "My soul refuses to be satisfied as long as it is a helpless witness of a single wrong, or a single misery." And this really gives the keynote to Gandhi's life. Being a man of the keenest human sympathies he cannot endure the sight of suffering in others. And suffering there is in abundance everywhere. But seeing all this he does not run away from it. He does not retire into the jungle and live a life of solitude. He plunges into the very thick of things. He goes to any length to remove those sufferings and redress those wrongs. And herein lies his heroism. He fears none. He faces the most powerful. He endures the cruelest sufferings himself that he may save suffering in others. And through all he has the conviction that God is with him; that God will sustain and comfort him.

And it is because of this warm and genuine sympathy, because he will himself make every sacrifice for the good of others, and because he relies on God, that he possesses the hold he has on Indian hearts. . . .

Gandhi would not have made the appeal he does . . . if they did not set store by religion. True, his appeal is to the sentiment of nationality. But others have made that appeal. And what has made Gandhi's appeal go home is its being backed by religion. He introduced *religion* into politics, and he won their hearts as no other politician has.

What Sir Francis and probably the world in general still fail to understand is the enormous power of such a religion as Gandhi's to permeate and to transform the entire political and social life of mankind. The peace which grows out of goodwill is an utterly different kind of peace from the "peace" of suppression, a "peace" enforced by an armed force ready to shed blood at a moment's notice! A "peace" supported by extensive preparation for military conflict, accompanied by arrogant gestures of self-satisfied patriotism and local pride!

Have we not suffered enough from that kind of "peace"? Can we not see a higher light? Can we see this dawn in India? Can we yield some of our barbarous traditions? Can we let go our local pride? Can we make some sacrifice of lesser goods for the sake of higher, supreme values?

If we are able to do these simple things, to become simple, to speak and act truth, to deal in a neighborly way with all men, this dawn may shine for us too, becoming a perfect day of peace and righteousness in a better and happier world.

HERBERT A. STURGES.

Two Englishmen on Gandhi

Very few of those who have written about Gandhi and his movement have been in India during any part of the momentous struggle that began there in 1930. Here we have a book* by two Englishmen who were in India through all that time. This advantage appears distinctly in the book. The assumptions, approach to the subject, and method of treating the material are fresh and different from what we have had hitherto. The authors are both missionaries of an unusual sort, belonging to a small group who have adopted entirely the Indian ways of living. This has given them a peculiarly intimate understanding of Indians and fitted them to give an unusual interpretation to the West. The first and last chapters were written by Mr. Winslow, the middle chapters by Mr. Elwin. There is a foreword by the Archbishop of York.

The contents are best described in the words of the introduction. The first chapter deals with the imminent attainment of freedom by India, and gives reasons why such a prospect should arouse, not so much fears of the disastrous consequences which may follow the coming of Swaraj, as hopes of the contribution which emancipated India may make to the world's advance.

The second chapter gives a picture of the man in whom the spirit of India has taken visible shape, and who was the outstanding figure at the London Conference. It does not attempt to give his story, which is now well known, but tries, with the help of some personal experiences and of some of the Mahatma's more recent writings and utterances, to add some fresh touches to a portrait now in the main outline familiar to the world.

The third chapter is concerned with the most fundamental and the most central of Gandhi's teachings—that of Satyagraha. It seeks to expound its meaning with some detail and exactitude; to illustrate its use from the different campaigns in which it has been made the principal weapon, and to discuss its value as a "moral equivalent for war."

The last chapter starts from the assumption that, whether we like it or not, India will in the near future be a free country, and seeks to estimate the part which the Christian church should play in this free India, and the conditions essential to her successfully fulfiling that part.

In trying to express my estimate of the book I am under some embarrassment because after I began to read it I found that one of the authors has quoted parts of one of my own books. Nevertheless, I am constrained to say that I believe that readers will find this book more illuminating, less conventional in thinking, and in some respects broader in imagination than the books we have had hitherto on this subject, except those by Gandhi himself (as edited by Mr. Andrews). And because of their Western background, the authors can clarify certain matters for Western readers better than even Gandhi himself. Mr. Elwin gives a vivid and truthful picture of Gandhi's personal qualities, achievements and influence; also a clear and interesting explanation of how and why Gandhi's methods work. He selects and mobilizes his quotations from Gandhi very effectively. Mr. Winslow's advice to missionaries is wise. The style of writing is simple, direct and moving. All those who want to understand what has been happening and is about to happen in India should read this book.

Mahatma Gandhi is engaged in creating and establishing a whole new system of human values. For this reason it is hard for us to understand him. But because new values are created by being lived by a tremendously strong and energetic person, our first approach to an understanding of the values is to try to understand the person. Let me therefore quote a little from this book—to give you a taste and start you off:

His life of renunciation speaks to the inmost soul of India. He is one of the few perfectly disinterested men that have walked this earth. You may disagree with his policy; you may even violently oppose it, but you cannot say that he is going to get anything out of it for himself. His self-forgetfulness is the secret of his self-possession and his humble self-confidence. He is conscious of his mission and therefore he has no fear. He has conquered fear, as he has conquered lust and pride and ambition.

* * * *

He is the incarnation of moral energy. His teaching has that quality of enthusiasm which is a test of truth. . . .

* * * *

He is not an orator; he has the power of arranging ideas

*Gandhi: The Dawn of Indian Freedom, by Jack C. Winslow and Verrier Elwin. Fleming H. Revell Company.

rather than words; yet the effect of his speeches is electrical. He is not a bookish man, but he conveys the impression of a deep and liberal culture. He is no mere visionary; he is a shrewd practical politician, with an extraordinary wide knowledge of human nature. But he is so dominated by his sense of spiritual realities that nothing can shake his optimistic faith in the efficiency of spiritual methods and the ultimate triumph of spiritual ideas.

* * * *

In the realm of politics, he has simplified the issues and directed attention to the primary human needs of India. He is interested in politics as a school, not of constitution-making, but of character-building. He has created a new public morality. He has introduced into human politics, says Romain Rolland, the strongest religious impetus of the last two thousand years. Above all, he has brought the ideal of generosity into politics. The very foundation of his Satyagraha is a sort of quixotic chivalry. He is always anxious to meet his opponents and to understand them. He has proved that in public life saintliness is not only practicable but necessary.

* * * *

In the realm of morals, he has again concentrated on the great human needs. He has built his ethical system not on the dead rock of scripture and scholastic traditions but on the living authority of sincerity and truth. His claims on the conscience of his followers are indeed exalted, but they are clear and lucid, and there is no doubt as to what he demands.

RICHARD B. GREGG.

Correspondence

Developments in India

Editor of UNITY:

. . . I do not see why you should, but possibly you may, wonder what has necessitated an immediate struggle in resistance to Britain. I will in short outline show how the Congress has been treated in London and what has happened in India in the meantime. Last year the Indian people, under the wise guidance of the Congress, waged a relentless war for complete independence. The Congress won and truce was signed to ensure final settlement. Gandhi went to London as the sole representative of the nation. In his first speech he said in unmistakable terms that he would rather be a rebel than a citizen of the empire as it existed. He stood there as a representative of the Congress and he would stick to the demands of his principals; but he knew the ground on which he stood and, confident of the faith of the Congress in him, he extended his hand of fellowship welcoming British tutelage for the time being. It was a welcome sign for the British people, but in the same degree as Gandhi bowed down in his demands the British politicians raised their prices. Gandhi came down to partial responsibility in the Centre, but his extreme goodness was mistaken as a mark of the weakness rather than the strength of his constituency. Gandhi almost came to his knees when he consented to accept even the bait of provincial autonomy. But Britain would not satisfy him on the army and exchange questions and they broke. True it is that those whom God seeks to destroy, he first turns them mad; so it has been with Britain. Like the wise Vidura in Prince Duryodhana's court Gandhi was refused even a pin's head. He returns to India fully convinced that India can look forward for nothing from a nation of shop-keepers who have tasted the blood of the Indian peasants. The representative of the nation returns in shame and sorrow, broken-hearted and convinced that Britain is bankrupt morally and materially. He sees that his duty to his country requires that he should struggle.

When he returns to India Gandhi will find that it is impossible to stay the hands even if he wants. The complete failure of the Round Table Conference has convinced the classes and the masses in India that nothing can be expected from the British people and that they are and must be the architects of their own liberties. The Congress has withdrawn from the Bardoli enquiry and has sent its representatives among the masses. Hijli and Chittagong outrages in Bengal, distress of tenants in United Provinces, a state of war in the Frontier Province, ill-considered official autocracy in Madras and grave injustice to Bardoli peasants in Bombay—all necessitate an immediate Satyagraha if the country is to be saved from violence. The government is making a free and unrestricted use of sections 144 and 124A, and indulges in imprisonments without trial, searches without warrant, proscription without cause, bans without justice, repression without reason, and persecution without proof of guilt. Time has come when India can bear it no longer, she must revolt non-violently, if she is to be saved from blood and fire. There is no wonder Jawaharlal says. Fight is coming—next week or next month is the question.

To make peace impossible by turning down every legitimate aspiration of the Indian people, to resort to brutal repression when they have taken to non-violent passive resistence, to thrust pin-pricks and spear thrusts when they come for settlement, and further to add insults and affronts to injuries by wild, insulting and arrogant harangues from high quarters, and then to charge that Young India resorts to "revolutionary" methods may be sound reason in the language of bureaucratic politics, but in ordinary language it is nothing short of forcing the bitter method on the fettered hands of Indian youths. Imprisonments for honest opinion, lathis and bullets for simple participations in processions or meetings, prohibitory orders on rightful activities and proscription on rightful expressions—such is the way in which India is being dragged on the path of "constitutional progress." Add to it a complete dwarfing of a whole nation comprising one-fifth of humanity, a total laying waste of a whole country big enough to be a continent, and the always impatient fire of youth and you will find that it can lead to nowhere but revolution. If we can keep our heads in the face of a wild parade of mad destruction of all that is dear and near to us, that is no reason why we should blow hot and angry words on those whose fire has blazed to destroy the major evil by admitting a smaller one. Remember, Jawaharlal Nehru echoed the mind of young people in every land in bondage when from the esteemed presidential chair of the Indian National Congress he declared, "Violence is bad, but slavery is worse." India knows that resorting to violence is for her the highest of unwisdom. She knows that practical common-sense should teach her to refrain from it. She knows that it is bad morality, she knows that it is against her creed and religion. She knows that it is bad politics and worse wisdom. But the rest of the world must know too that hungry people do not argue, they only rise. Hunger is the father of violent and infuriated revolution. If such a catastrophe is to be avoided it is imperative that Gandhi should make a "dash" for another non-violent struggle, and even then, while we may look forward for the general sobriety of the Indian people through his good offices, we must keep our heads cool if some impatient young idealists blow out their brains in wild fury. To indulge in strong language would be adding fuel to fire, in fact fanning their desperation.

Ahmedabad, India *S.

*This letter, addressed personally to Mr. Holmes, is written by a distinguished Indian. It must be obvious to our readers why his name is not used.—Editor.

Two Trans-Pacific Pacifists

Editor of UNITY:

Among numerous photographs given me from time to time is one with greetings from Dr. David Starr Jordan. He was then seventy-seven years of age. He recently died in his eighty-first year. The picture depicts a man of striking personality, massive frame, heavy mustache, shaggy hair and tired eyes. His favorite, "Jock," stands beside him, while at the bottom of the photograph, beneath Dr. Jordan's signature, is the imprint of the animal's foot and the words, "Jock, his mark."

Dr. Jordan was a great Chancellor of Stanford University. He was ever vigorous in upholding and demanding the finest moral ideals on the part of the student body. He was quick to discern the qualifications of individuals—his discovery of Herbert Hoover was a well known case in point. He was a world authority on the science of fishes. He was a great teacher. He was a lover of humanity and, with genuine conviction, pled for human rights and democracy. He is reputed to have said to a friend, "I always try to look twenty-five years ahead."

It was my lot to frequently call on Dr. Jordan, in his

office at Leland Stanford University. The room was always filled with books, distributed about chaotically; while on a big table, or on the floor, were piles of literature, devoted to international peace. A goodly part of this literature was from his own pen. He always gave a warm welcome to those who were interested in the great cause to which he had devoted so much of his talents and strength. He would immediately plunge into giving information to any caller. Thus I remember that when the United States government decided to enter the Great War he told me Woodrow Wilson, with whom he was acquainted, desired to pose in history as the savior of the British Empire. It was pathetic to hear him tell of the meeting in Baltimore at that period when he was mobbed by clerks, and others, already interested in the armament trade.

International peace was more than a hobby with Dr. Jordan. He worked for it with unflagging zeal in and out of season. At the close of one of his visits to Japan he said: "No nation was ever able to maintain at the same time a great army, a great navy, a vigorous foreign policy, a great debt, and the prosperity of the people. Two of the five may be held for the time and occasionally three, but never more." Is this axiom, despite much effort and talk on behalf of international goodwill, remembered by governments today?

In 1853, when Admiral Perry's fleet entered the harbor of Tokyo, Eichi Shibusawa, then in his teens, rushed to the defense of his terror-stricken people. The peaceful intentions of the "black ships" were not understood at the moment. This boy was a member of the celebrated Samurai, the military caste of Japan.

After he reached maturity he entered the finance department of the government, but soon engaged in business on his own account. He has often been called the J. Pierpont Morgan of Japan. He founded and became the first president of the first Japanese bank, which now has a capital of $28,750,000 and a reserve of $31,400,000. He was founder and president of the first chamber of commerce and promoted many of the larger business enterprises of the empire.

Shibusawa was an intimate friend of leading Americans. He was chairman of the committee to welcome General Grant during the trip of the ex-president around the world. He devoted much of his life to the promotion of social welfare. One of the particular objects of his care was the Tokyo Home for the Aged and Infirm. It is safe to say he visited that institution once a week for thirty years.

He was always deeply concerned that personal and national honor be maintained. The story is told of him that at a time of national crisis, involving the integrity of some contractors, he sent for a native Christian pastor who until late in the evening read to him from the Bible. It was generally believed that he was impressed with the verity and ethics of the New Testament, but, like many others in the Far East, could not announce himself as a Christian because of the inconsistencies of many who profess the Christian faith.

Viscount Shibusawa was an ardent internationalist, and a loyal friend of the United States. Both countries owe him a great debt of gratitude because of his services at critical periods. During two visits to Japan, in connection with work on behalf of international goodwill, I was privileged to meet with him. The last time was at a dinner in the beautiful building of the Banker's Club, Tokyo, when a large number of notable Japanese, including peers, members of the cabinet and navy were present. Viscount Shibusawa presided. When responding to my address and expressing appreciation of the general feeling of friendship toward his country in America he courteously declared that it would be impossible to remove the grievous feeling in Japan toward the United States until the law of 1921-24, excluding Japanese immigrants from the quota, be changed to include his countrymen. As a change in the law would permit less than 175 immigrants annually to enter our ports I think, with most of our thoughtful citizens, that he was right.

It has been my lot to meet leaders of liberal thought in many countries, and I consider this eminent Japanese to have been among the most impressive of them all. He was of large frame, dignified in manner and address.

The world is poorer because Viscount Shibusawa and Dr. David Starr Jordan, living on opposite shores of the Pacific Ocean, have, with the inexorable sweep of time, been carried into the Kingdom of Peace.

WILLIAM C. ALLEN

Denver, Colorado

The Field

(*Continued from page* 266)

(3) As those who lived before us met and struggled with the evils of their times, so we are called to service in overcoming those of our time. The founders of the Society of Friends helped to arouse their age to the miseries of the poor, the criminals, the insane; our grandfathers dealt with a world careless of injustice in the suppression of women; the older folk among us remember a generation thoughtless of the evils of intemperance.

We live now in a time still blind, in spite of terrible experiences, to the agonies of international warfare and only half conscious of the suffering due to the industrial conflict for wealth and favor. We recall that the Great Teacher especially condemned acquisitiveness and the spirit of dictation. We humbly acknowledge that we have yielded to these selfish desires and that we are called—as are all men—to seek such changes in our social, industrial and financial systems as will replace the concentration of wealth and power by a reasonable distribution of both. We make no claim to be experts as to methods; but it is for all, not for experts only, to decide on ends. We believe the end for all human institutions is the creation of a society based on universal good will, providing security for all in the possession of life, liberty and opportunity. This involves of necessity that all—not accidental victims—shall bear the burdens of sickness, accident, old age and unemployment, and that the present day contrasts in possession of wealth, comfort and power shall disappear.

We dedicate ourselves to these ends, looking to a saner and more beautiful human society.

Message Committee of Friends' General Conference,
JESSE H. HOLMES, *Chairman.*

A Note from Paris

We have just spent a very pleasant evening as the guests of Mr. Jean Languet, a former member of the French Parliament. The last time I saw Mr. Longuet was some years ago in Toronto when I acted as chairman of a meeting at which he was the lecturer. On that occasion we, or the audience, were carefuly protected by a large squad of city police. Here in his own native city, where he is a member of the City Council, an advocate as well as a journalist, Mr. Longuet is inclined, I should judge, to be rather amused at the Toronto idea of a radical.

Mr. Longuet had just returned from England where he had followed closely and to some extent participated in the British elections. According to him Socialism is anything but dead or dying in England. Seven millions of convinced voters are still a force to be reckoned with, even though an absurd electoral system deprives them of anything like their proper representation in Parliament.

The French Socialists differ in toto from the official French view of security. "Our only security," declared Mr. Longuet, "lies in disarmament." Further, the Socialist paper, the *Populaire,* has been opposing the Capitalist press on the question of reparations and has taken much the position of the German Socialists.

The Socialist party is strongest in the cities outside Paris and especially in the South where it has considerable support from the farmers. In Paris, the Communist influence has been directed against the Socialists and has been strong enough to split the Labor vote and thus assist in the election of representatives of reactionary groups.

Mr. Jean Longuet, by the way, is a grandson of Karl Marx.

* * *

Somehow I feel a bit older here in Paris. It is some thirty-one years since I first visited the city. In these years so many things have happened! Under the Arc de Triomphe there is now a tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Only a few days ago, we visited the tomb to the Unknown Soldier in Berlin. Millions of unknown soldiers lie in battlefields. Thos. Cook & Son have now several new excursions—English, Americans or Canadians can visit their favorite battlefields. And what did the world war accomplish?

Rue de Boulogne is now known as Avenue Foch and Foch is dead. Only the debts and the hatreds and the fears still remain.

The Palais de Versailles seemed to me less grand and a bit more faded. It was the Galerie des Glaces that interested me. A note in the Guide-book states that it was in this room that "the Emperor William I was proclaimed German Emperor in 1871, and here nearly fifty years after, the delegates of Republican Germany signed the Peace Treaty on June 28th, 1919." I had forgotten the significance of that room. Was there no other room in Europe in which the Treaty of Peace could have been signed? No! for it was a treaty of revenge—and now this revenge brings the fear of counter revenge. Thirty years ago I had thought of 1871 as something finished before I was born. Now I know that 1919 was not something finished but only one more incident in the fratricidal struggle that has cursed Europe through the centuries.

There is altogether too much of Versailles in the Peace Treaty. The gilded, mirrored rooms with their war paintings are symbolic of the pomp and power of ancient dynasties, obsolete policies, and false ideals. From these the future must escape.

Yet it was here that the French revolution wreaked its fury; it was here that the new idealism expressed itself in the motto: "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." The words were carved into stone, but little more than the carved words remain. Napoleon came. Pomp and power in a new guise—perhaps somewhat less responsible and more ruthless than the old. And France now passes by the carved words of the new era and worships at the shrine of Napoleon.

Militarism — Nationalism — Imperialism—all are epitomized in post-war France. Even a visit to the International Colonial Exhibition but intensifies the impressions. British imperialism we have perhaps taken for granted. Were we not God's chosen people bearing the white man's burden? We resented Germany's ambition to secure a place in the sun; denounced her militarism; were shocked at her ideas of "Deuschland uber Alles" and "Me und Gott." But only now are we recognizing that the self-same Imperialism of Germany—and may I say—of England is now reappearing in intensified form in France and, I might add, in African Native Soldiers, vast native populations, rich and only partly developed countries, Satellite European nations, Financial dictatorship—all are a part of this modern imperialism.

This is one of the results of the war and the end of it all no one can predict. Like the Bourbons, France has forgotten nothing, and learned nothing. She remembers that her territory has been invaded; that she had to pay reparations. To attain security she will leave nothing undone—that is along the old lines.

She is logical, yes; powerful, yes! No opposition within her own barriers has yet become vocal. For some time, she may ride on victorious and yet if history teaches anything she is riding for a fall.

"Liberty, Equality, Fraternity"—it will take another revolution to make those words vital again.

With the triumph of so-called "Nationalism" in England, is it any wonder one feels a bit older.—*J. S. Woodsworth, M. P.*, in Winnipeg *Weekly News.*

The Poetry Editors of **UNITY,**

LUCIA TRENT and RALPH CHEYNEY

offer in their new joint book:

DREAMERS' HOUSE

a charming gift for your friends and a book you will appreciate having in your library.

Foreword by Glenn Ward Dresbach. Publisher: Robert Packard & Co., Chicago.

$1.60, postpaid

Order, autographed, from its authors at 259 South 44th St., Philadelphia, Pa.

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs, Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

Phone Oakland 0489 **JANITORS' SUPPLIES**
Everything in HARDWARE
AT
JOHNSON'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

A GIFT FOR A FRIEND

A Special Offer of UNITY

New Subscriptions
$2.00 for one year, to include the

GANDHI NUMBER

Containing articles by:

Mahatma Gandhi
John Haynes Holmes
Louis I. Newman
Haridas T. Muzumdar
Stephen S. Wise
Marie Falconer
Marguerite Emilio
J. T. Sunderland
Curtis W. Reese
L. N. Gubil Sandaresen
J. C. Kumarappa

Send your order early to

Unity Publishing Company, 700 Oakwood Boulevard Chicago

INDIA TODAY AND TOMORROW SERIES

Edited by

HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR, M.A., PH.D.
Friend and Biographer of Gandhi

In view of the unprecedented crisis in India and the amazing meagreness of news dribbling through British censorship it has been deemed advisable to launch the *India Today and Tomorrow Series.* Our attempt will be to present first hand, reliable and documentary material regarding India's non-violent revolution which redounds to the credit of Gandhi and his fellow-countrymen and promises the birth of a warless world. When this glorious chapter of human history is in the making, there is no need to apologize for capturing its salient features and preserving them for posterity.

The series of five numbers as contemplated at present will consist of:

No. 1 INDIA'S NON-VIOLENT REVOLUTION (Published).
No. 2. THE PESHAWAR TRAGEDY (Published).
No. 3. THE STORY OF PEACE NEGOTIATIONS (Soon ready).
No. 4. THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE (In preparation).
No. 5. THE UNITED STATES OF INDIA (In preparation).

Make sure of your full set of this series by sending in a dollar promptly.

This is not a money-making venture—we want to spread the truth about India. One dollar will bring you the entire set of the series.

Please send your dollar to

INDIA TODAY AND TOMORROW SERIES

20 Vesey Street
New York City